

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO.  |  |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 08/319,411 10/06/1994                                   |                 | PETER NIELSEN        | ISIS1158                | 8648              |  |
| 32650   | 7590 09/16/2005 |                      | EXAMINER                |                   |  |
| WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP<br>ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR |                 |                      | MARSCHEL                | MARSCHEL, ARDIN H |  |
| PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103                                  |                 |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER      |  |
|   | ,               | •                    | 1631                    |                   |  |
|   |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 09/16/200: | 5                 |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| $\overline{}$ |
|---------------|
| /             |
| $\sim$        |
| - 1           |
| _/            |

## Advisory Action

| Application No. | Applicant(s)   |   |
|-----------------|----------------|---|
| 08/319,411      | NIELSEN ET AL. | • |
| Examiner        | Art Unit       |   |
| Ardin Marechel  | 1631           |   |

| Advisory Action  | 00/313,411  | MILEOLIA ET AL.                                     |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief   | Examiner  | Art Unit  |   |  |  |  |
|  | Ardin Marschel  | 1631  |   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence add                                   | ress                                    |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>17 March 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| . The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la<br>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or<br>TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7   | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin<br>(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE<br>06.07(f).                                       | g date of the final rejecti<br>E FIRST REPLY WAS F  | on.<br>ILED WITHIN                      |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL   | tension and the corresponding amount<br>shortened statutory period for reply orig<br>than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |  |  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>05 April 2005</u> . A brief i date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply   | ny extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3   | 7(e)), to avoid dismis                              | sal of the                              |  |  |  |
| AMENDMENTS   |   | •   |   |  |  |  |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  | corresponding number of finally rej   | ected claims.                                       |   |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1  | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co   | mpliant Amendment                                   | (PTOL-324).                             |  |  |  |
| $\overline{5}$ . $\overline{\boxtimes}$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)  |   | •   |   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>  | lowable if submitted in a separate,   | timely filed amendme                                | ent canceling the                       |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the prepased emendment(s): a)   | will not be entered, or b) 🛛 wi   | II be entered and an e                              | explanation of                          |  |  |  |
| how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-<br>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:<br>Claim(s) allowed:   | vided below or appended.  | ·   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>53,63 and 64</u> .   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   | •   |   |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and applicant failed to good applicant failed to good and  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to contain the contained of the contained o | vercome all rejections under appe   | al and/or appellant fai                             | ls to provide a                         |  |  |  |
| showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  1. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  | A de la NOT ale la de la  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br>of reasons of record as further explained as attached.  |   |   | nce because:                            |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☒ Other: 1 copy of Exr. Int. Sum.</li> </ul>  | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N   | lo(s)   |   |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
|  |   |   | ļ                                       |  |  |  |
|  |   |   | ļ                                       |  |  |  |
|  |   |   | ļ                                       |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 08/319,411

Art Unit: 1631

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## <u>Further explanation of item # 1 on the enclosed Advisory action:</u>

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 53, 63, and 64 based on claims 1, 4, 5, and 7 of U.S. Patent 6,395,474 is maintained and reiterated from the previous office action, mailed 10/6/04, and reiterated in the Advisory action, mailed 12/23/04.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 53 and 63 based on claims 1 and 12 of U.S. Patent 6,613,873 is maintained and reiterated from the previous office action, mailed 10/6/04, and reiterated in the Advisory action, mailed 12/23/04.

For both the above Patent claims, the overlapping and common embodiments of peptide nucleic acid are part of a small genus in which each member is immediately envisioned which is also as claimed in claims 53, 63, and 64 of the instant application. In the Interview of 3/3/05 Joe Lucci requested review of In re Baird, 29 USPQ2d 1552,1552. Consideration of said In re Baird as to non-obviousness reveals that the genus claims utilized as alleged suggesting species therein covered an estimated 100 million species which is a vastly different fact pattern from the instant application and Patent claims which cover only a few species of linkage types numbering even fewer that a dozen. Such a small genus of species reasonably suggests and motivates such species due to the immediate envisioning of each of these species in such a small genus. Thus In re Baird is moot regarding overcoming these rejections due to the vastly different fact pattern therein compared to the above reiterated and maintained rejections.

No claim is allowed.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices

Application/Control Number: 08/319,411

Art Unit: 1631

published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., Supervisory Patent Examiner, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instrument Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 7, 2005

ARDIN H. MARSCHEL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER Page 3